arXiv:1301.4285v1 [math.OC] 18 Jan 2013

On the Method of Interconnection and Damping Assignment Passivity-Based Control for the Stabilization of Mechanical Systems

Dong Eui Chang
Department of Applied Mathematics
University of Waterloo
200 University Avenue West
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada
email: dechang@math.uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

Interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control (IDA-PBC) is an excellent method to stabilize mechanical systems in the Hamiltonian formalism. In this paper, several improvements are made on the IDA-PBC method. The skew-symmetric interconnection submatrix in the conventional form of IDA-PBC is shown to have some redundancy for systems with the number of degrees of freedom greater than two, containing unnecessary components that do not contribute to the dynamics. To completely remove this redundancy, use of quadratic gyroscopic forces is proposed in place of the skew-symmetric interconnection submatrix. Reduction of the number of the matching partial differential equations in IDA-PBC, and simplification of the structure of the matching partial differential equations are achieved by eliminating the gyroscopic force from the matching partial differential equations. In addition, easily verifiable criteria are provided for Lyapunov/exponential stabilizability by IDA-PBC for all linear controlled Hamiltonian systems with arbitrary degree of underactuation and for all nonlinear controlled Hamiltonian systems with one degree of underactuation. A general design procedure for IDA-PBC is given and illustrated with two examples. This paper renders the IDA-PBC method as powerful as the controlled Lagrangian method that is a Lagrangian counterpart of IDA-PBC.

1 Introduction

Mechanical systems are ubiquitous in nature and engineering, and there have been many studies on modeling motions of insects, animals, fish and humans in the framework of mechanics and control. For example, a model for clock-actuated legged locomotion of human and biologically-inspired robots is proposed and analyzed in [20]. A control-theoretic strategy for human walking gait assistance is suggested using the biped model to lessen the perceived weight of a patient's center of mass through a robotic angle-foot orthosis with one actuated degree-of-freedom [15]. A time-scaling control law is developed and applied to two passive-dynamic bipeds: the compass-gait biped and a simple biped with torso [16]. In all of these works, one of the main objectives is to study stability and stabilization of the motion of systems.

The energy shaping method stands out among several methods for stabilization of mechanical systems since it preserves the mechanical structure, provides a systematic procedure for constructing control laws, and yields a large region of stability for closed-loop systems. The idea of the energy shaping method is simple. Given an unstable mechanical system, one transforms it via feedback to a stable mechanical system whose total energy function obtains a minimum value at the equilibrium of interest. In this process of transformation, the original total energy function with a saddle-type critical point at the equilibrium point gets transformed to a new total energy function with a minimum value at the equilibrium point. In order to find such a new mechanical system with a stable energy function, one has to solve partial differential equations (PDEs) for the mass matrix and the potential function of the new mechanical system. The PDEs for the new mass matrix are called kinetic matching conditions or kinetic matching PDEs, and the PDEs for the new potential function are called potential matching conditions or potential matching PDEs. Hence, understanding the structure of the matching PDEs and their solvability is important.

The idea of potential energy shaping for stabilization of a mechanical system dates back to [2]. The notion of kinetic energy shaping first appeared in [3]. The idea of total energy shaping was introduced in [4, 6], and has then been actively developed [5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 21]. There are two approaches to energy shaping: the Lagrangian approach and the Hamiltonian approach. The energy shaping method is called the method of controlled Lagrangians on the Lagrangian side and the method of interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control (IDA-PBC) on the Hamiltonian side. It is proven that the two approaches are equivalent [8]. Chang [9] has then improved the Lagrangian method by completely characterizing quadratic gyroscopic forces, reducing the number of matching conditions for energy shaping, and finding necessary and sufficient conditions for stabilizability by energy shaping for the class of all linear mechanical systems with arbitrary degree of underactuation and the class of all nonlinear mechanical systems with underactuation degree one. In contrast to these developments on the Lagrangian side, there has been a lag in the development on the Hamiltonian side.

In this paper, we make improvement of the method of IDA-PBC in several ways so that the IDA-PBC method becomes as strong as its Lagrangian counterpart. First, we propose a new form of IDA-PBC by introducing a quadratic gyroscopic force. The skew-symmetric interconnection matrix in the conventional form of IDA-PBC [1, 18], is shown to have unnecessary components that do not appear in the system dynamics with the number of degrees of freedom greater than two. To remove the unnecessary components, use of quadratic gyroscopic force is proposed in place of the skew-symmetric interconnection matrix. Second, the kinetic matching conditions get decomposed into two sets: one containing no components of the gyroscopic force and the other containing components of the gyroscopic force. The first set constitutes a new reduced set of kinetic matching PDEs and the second is used to algebraically define the gyroscopic force. This decomposition substantially reduces the number of kinetic matching PDEs. For example, if the degree of underactuation is one, there is only one kinetic matching PDE, irrespective of the number of degrees of freedom. Moreover, when the co-distribution spanned by actuation (or control) co-vector fields is integrable, the new reduced matching PDEs contain a smaller number of entries of the unknown mass matrix, which was never discovered in the past. Third, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for stabilizability by IDA-PBC for the class of all linear mechanical systems with an arbitrary degree of underactuation and for the class of all nonlinear mechanical systems with one degree of underactuation. These conditions can be easily verified in advance before solving the matching PDEs. Fourth, a step-by-step synthesis procedure with IDA-PBC is provided and the main results are illustrated with two examples.

2 Main Results

We review some basic notions on tensors, derive important lemmas, present a new form of IDA-PBC and compare it with the conventional form. Although both forms are shown to be theoretically equivalent for use in IDA-PBC, the new one has the advantage that it contains fewer components. We then exclusively work with the new form. We derive matching conditions for energy shaping and decompose them into two parts: one without the gyroscopic term and the other with gyroscopic term. This decomposition allows to reduce the number of matching PDEs. We discuss conditions for stabilizability by IDA-PBC that can be verified easily, and illustrate the results with two examples.

2.1 Important Lemmas

Let V be an n-dimensional real vector space and V^* its dual space. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a basis of V, and $\{e^1, \dots, e^n\}$ its dual basis such that $\langle e^i, e_j \rangle = \delta^i_j$, where $\langle , \rangle$ is the canonical pairing between dual vectors and vectors, and δ^i_j is the Kronecker delta. The tensor product of two vector spaces V and W is denoted by $V \otimes W$, and each element of $V \otimes W$ is a linear combination of elements of the form $v \otimes w$, where $v \in V$ and $w \in W$. The r-fold tensor product of a vector space V is denoted by $V^{\otimes r}$ or $\otimes^r V$. An (r, s)-tensor T on V is written as

$$T = T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_r} \otimes e^{j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e^{j_s},$$

where the Einstein summation convention is enforced. The contraction of an $(r, 0)$-tensor $S = S^{i_1 \cdots i_r} e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_r}$ and a $(0, s)$-tensor $T = T_{j_1 \cdots j_s} e^{j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e^{j_s}$ with $r \leq s$, is defined and denoted by

$$S \lrcorner T = S^{i_1 \cdots i_r} T_{i_1 \cdots i_r i_{r+1} \cdots i_s} e^{i_{r+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e^{i_s}.$$

One can identify each $(0,s)$-tensor T with a multi-linear map $\tilde{T} : V \times \cdots \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}(v_1, \cdots, v_s) &= v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_s \lrcorner T \\ &= v_s \lrcorner \cdots \lrcorner v_1 \lrcorner T.\end{aligned}$$

Define the symmetrization operator $\mathrm{Sym} : V^{\otimes r} \to V^{\otimes r}$ by

$$\mathrm{Sym}(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_r) = \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{S}_r} v_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\sigma(r)},$$

where S_r is the symmetric group of $\{1, \ldots, r\}$ and it is understood that Sym is linearly extended to $V^{\otimes r}$.

A (0, 3)-tensor $C = C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ on V is said to be gyroscopic if it satisfies

$$C(u,v,w) = C(v,u,w) \quad \forall u,v,w \in V, \tag{1}$$

$$C(u,v,w) + C(v,w,u) + C(w,u,v) = 0 \quad \forall u,v,w \in V. \tag{2}$$

In coordinates, (1) and (2) are equivalent, respectively, to the following

$$C_{ijk} = C_{jik}, \tag{3}$$

$$C_{ijk} + C_{jki} + C_{kij} = 0 \tag{4}$$

for all i, j, k. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(V) &= \{C \in V^{*\otimes 3} \mid \text{properties (1) and (2) hold}\} \\ &= \{C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \mid \text{properties (3) and (4) hold}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(V) &= \{B \in V^{*\otimes 3} \mid B(u,v,w) = -B(u,w,v) \forall u,v,w \in V\} \\ &= \{B_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \mid B_{ijk} = -B_{ikj}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1. *Let* $n = \dim V$. *Then,* $\dim \mathcal{B}(V) = \frac{n^2(n-1)}{2}$ *and* $\dim \mathcal{C}(V) = \frac{n(n^2-1)}{3}$.

Proof. Due to the skew-symmetry property $B_{ijk} = -B_{ikj}$, we have $\dim \mathcal{B}(V) = \frac{n^2(n-1)}{2}$. To compute $\dim \mathcal{C}(V)$, we consider three cases: 1) all three identical indices; 2) two identical indices and one distinct index; and 3) three distinct indices. For case 1, we only have $C_{iii} = 0$ by (4). For case 2, we have $C_{iki} = C_{kii} = -\frac{1}{2} C_{iik}$ for all $i \neq k$ by (3) and (4). Hence, the number of independent components in this case is $n(n-1)$. For case 3, the number of independent components is $\frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{3}$ by (3) and (4). Hence, $\dim \mathcal{C}(V) = 0 + n(n-1) + \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{3} = \frac{n(n^2-1)}{3}$. □

Lemma 2. *Let* $\psi : \mathcal{B}(V) \to V^{*\otimes 3}$ *be a linear map defined as*

$$\psi(B_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k) = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik}) e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \tag{5}$$

for all $B_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{B}(V)$. *Then,* $\psi(\mathcal{B}(V)) = \mathcal{C}(V)$, *i.e., the image of* $\mathcal{B}(V)$ *under the map* ψ *equals* $\mathcal{C}(V)$. *Moreover,* $\dim \ker \psi = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6}$, *where* $n = \dim V$.

Proof. First, we show that $\psi(\mathcal{B}(V)) \subset \mathcal{C}(V)$. Choose any $B = B_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in B(V)$. Let $C = \psi(B)$. In coordinates, $C_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik})$, where $C = C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$. Then, $C_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik}) = \frac{1}{2}(B_{jik} + B_{ijk}) = C_{jik}$, satisfying (3). Also, $C_{ijk} + C_{jki} + C_{kij} = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik}) + \frac{1}{2}(B_{jki} + B_{kji}) + \frac{1}{2}(B_{kij} + B_{ikj}) = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik} - B_{jik} + B_{kji} - B_{kji} - B_{ijk}) = 0$, satisfying (4). Hence, $\psi(\mathcal{B}(V)) \subset \mathcal{C}(V)$.

We now show $\mathcal{C}(V) \subset \psi(\mathcal{B}(V))$. Choose any $C = C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{C}(V)$ such that C_{ijk} satisfies (3) and (4). It suffices to choose a tensor $B = B_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ such that $\psi(B) = C$. Let $B_{iii} = 0$ for all i. For all $i \neq k$, let $B_{iik} = C_{iik}$, $B_{iki} = -C_{iik}$ and $B_{kii} = 0$. For all $i < j < k$, let

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ijk} &= 2C_{ijk}, \quad & B_{kij} &= -2C_{jki}, \quad & B_{jki} &= 0, \\ B_{ikj} &= -2C_{ijk}, \quad & B_{kji} &= 2C_{jki}, \quad & B_{jik} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is easy to show $\psi(B) = C$ for the B constructed above. Hence, $\mathcal{C}(V) \subset \psi(\mathcal{B}(V))$. Since $\psi(\mathcal{B}(V)) \subset \mathcal{C}(V)$ and $\mathcal{C}(V) \subset \psi(\mathcal{B}(V))$, it follows that $\psi(\mathcal{B}(V)) = \mathcal{C}(V)$.

Since ψ is onto, $\dim \ker \psi = \dim \mathcal{B}(V) - \dim \mathcal{C}(V) = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6}$ by Lemma 1. □

For a manifold M, $\mathcal{B}(M)$ and $\mathcal{C}(M)$ denote the sets of the tensor fields on M such that at each point $q \in M$, $\mathcal{B}(M)_q$ and $\mathcal{C}(M)_q$ are equal to $\mathcal{B}(T_qM)$ and $\mathcal{C}(T_qM)$, respectively, where T_qM denotes the tangent space to M at q.

Lemma 3. *1. For a* $(0,s)$*-tensor* T *on a vector space* V, $T(v, \ldots, v) = 0$ *for all* $v \in V$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{Sym}(T) = 0$.

2. Suppose that a $(0,3)$*-tensor* C *on* V *satisfies (1). Then,* $\mathrm{Sym}(C) = 0$ *if and only if* C *satisfies (2).*

Proof. (a) Trivial by definition of Sym.

(b) Let $C = C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$. Then, $0 = \mathrm{Sym}(C) \Leftrightarrow 0 = \frac{1}{6}(C_{ijk} + C_{jki} + C_{kij} + C_{jik} + C_{kji} + C_{ikj}) = \frac{1}{3}(C_{ijk} + C_{jki} + C_{kij}) \Leftrightarrow C$ satisfies (2). □

Lemma 4. *Let* $V = \tilde{V} \oplus \hat{V}$, *and* $S = S_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ *be a* $(0,3)$*-tensor on* V *that satisfies*

$$S(u, v, w) = S(v, u, w) \quad \forall u, v, w \in V. \tag{6}$$

Then, the following are equivalent:

(a) *There exists a* $(0,3)$*-tensor* $C = C_{ijk} e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ *that satisfies (1), (2) and*

$$C(v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}) = S(v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}) \ \forall v_1, v_2 \in V, \tilde{v} \in \tilde{V}. \tag{7}$$

(b) $S(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3) + S(\tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3, \tilde{v}_1) + S(\tilde{v}_3, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) = 0 \quad \forall \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3 \in \tilde{V}$.

Proof. (a) ⇒ (b): Trivial.

(b) ⇒ (a): We prove this in coordinates since it will be conveniently used later. Let $\dim V = n$, $\dim \tilde{V} = n - m$ and $\dim \hat{V} = m$. Use the following three groups of indices: $i, j, k = 1, \ldots, n$; $\alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1, \ldots, n - m$; and $a, b, c = (n - m + 1), \ldots, n$. Suppose $V = \operatorname{span}\{e_i\}$, $\tilde{V} = \operatorname{span}\{e_\alpha\}$ and $\hat{V} = \operatorname{span}\{e_a\}$. Define C_{ijk} as follows:

$$C_{ij\alpha} = S_{ij\alpha}, \tag{8}$$

$$C_{\alpha\beta a} = -S_{\beta a\alpha} - S_{a\alpha\beta}, \tag{9}$$

$$C_{\alpha ab} = C_{b\alpha a} = -\frac{1}{2} S_{ab\alpha}, \tag{10}$$

$$C_{abc} = 0. \tag{11}$$

It is then easy to show that C_{ijk} satisfies (3), (4) and (7). Instead of $C_{abc} = 0$, one can alternatively choose arbitrary C_{abc} such that $C_{abc} = C_{bac}$ and $C_{abc} + C_{bca} + C_{cab} = 0$. ☐

2.2 New Form of IDA-PBC for Mechanical Systems

Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\{e^1, \ldots, e^n\}$ its dual basis. For convenience, we identify $\mathbb{R}^n$ with its dual space $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$, but we follow the convention that position vector $q = q^i e_i$ is in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and momentum vector $p = p_i e^i$ is in $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$. For the sake of simplicity we assume that every function is smooth.

Let us consider a controlled Hamiltonian system of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \dot{p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_q H \\ \partial_p H \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G(q) \end{bmatrix} u \tag{12}$$

where $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \leq n$, I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, $G(q)$ is an $n \times m$ matrix with $\operatorname{rank} G(q) = m$ for each q, and

$$H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2} p^T M^{-1}(q) p + V(q)$$

is the Hamiltonian function of the system, where $M(q)$ is an $n \times n$ positive definite symmetric matrix and $V(q)$ is a function called the potential function of the system. We say that this system has n degrees of freedom and $(n - m)$ degrees of underactuation. Throughout this paper, we assume that $(q, p) = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be an equilibrium point of the system to be stabilized. The controlled Hamiltonian system (12) shall be called linear if the matrices

$M(q)$ and $G(q)$ are constant and the function $V(q)$ is a quadratic function of q. Otherwise, it shall be called nonlinear.

To achieve stabilization of the equilibrium point at the origin, we have the objective of finding a feedback law $u = u(q,p)$ that transforms the system (12) to the following desired form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \dot{p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M^{-1}(q)\widehat{M}(q) \\ -\widehat{M}(q)M^{-1}(q) & -G(q)K_v(q)G^T(q) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_q \widehat{H} \\ \partial_p \widehat{H} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$\widehat{H}(q,p) = \frac{1}{2}p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}(q)p + \widehat{V}(q) \tag{14}$$

is a desired Hamiltonian with an $n \times n$ positive definite symmetric matrix $\widehat{M}(q)$ and a function $\widehat{V}(q)$ having a non-degenerate minimum at $q = 0$; $K_v(q)$ is an $m \times m$ positive definite symmetric matrix, and $C = C_{ijk}(q)e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ is a $(0,3)$-tensor field that pointwise satisfies (1) and (2), i.e., $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In (13), it is understood that

$$\widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C = C_{ijk}\widehat{M}^{i\ell}\widehat{M}^{jr}p_\ell p_r e^k, \tag{15}$$

where $\widehat{M}^{ij}$ denotes the (i,j)-th entry of the inverse matrix $\widehat{M}^{-1}$ of $\widehat{M}$. Without loss of generality we have symmetrized C_{ijk} with respect to its first two indices (property (1) or (3)) because $\widehat{M}^{-1}p$ appears quadratically in (15). Notice that $\mathrm{Sym}(C) = 0$ by statement 2 of Lemma 3. The function $\widehat{V}$ is called the potential energy of the system (13).

If the transformation of (12) to (13) is possible, then the closed-loop system is at least Lyapunov stable with $\widehat{H}$ as Lyapunov function since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\widehat{H}}{dt} &= \dot{q}\frac{\partial \widehat{H}}{\partial q} + \dot{p}\frac{\partial \widehat{H}}{\partial p} \\ &= -p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}GK_vG^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p + C(\widehat{M}^{-1}p, \widehat{M}^{-1}p, \widehat{M}^{-1}p) \\ &= -p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}GK_vG^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\widehat{M}^{-1}p, \widehat{M}^{-1}p, \widehat{M}^{-1}p) = 0$ by (2) or statement 1 of Lemma 3. Since the term $\widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C$ does not change the Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}$, it is called the gyroscopic force.

2.3 Comparison of the New Form of IDA-PBC with the Conventional One for Mechanical Systems

In the conventional method of IDA-PBC [1, 18], for a given system of the form (12), the following desired form of controlled Hamiltonian system in place of (13) is used

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \dot{p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M^{-1}(q)\widehat{M}(q) \\ -\widehat{M}(q)M^{-1}(q) & J(q,p) - G(q)K_v(q)G^T(q) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_q \widehat{H} \\ \partial_p \widehat{H} \end{bmatrix} \tag{16}$$

with the Hamiltonian (14), where $J(q,p)$ is an $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix that is linear in p. In other words, the (i,j)-th entry $J_{ij}(q,p)$ of $J(q,p)$ is written as

$$J_{ij}(q,p) = J_{ij}^k(q)p_k$$

where J_{ij}^k satisfies

$$J_{ij}^k = -J_{ji}^k \tag{17}$$

due to the skew symmetry assumption on $J(q,p)$. Define $B = B_{ijk}(q)e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$B_{kij} = J_{ji}^\ell \widehat{M}_{\ell k}, \tag{18}$$

which is indeed in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by (17). Since $\widehat{M}$ is invertible, the relationship in (18) between (B_{ijk}) and (J_{ij}^k) is bijective.

Let $F^J = F_i^J e^i$ be the force term $J(q,p)\partial_p \widehat{H}$ in (16), which can be written componentwise as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} F_i^J &= J_{ij}^k \widehat{M}^{j\ell} p_k p_\ell \\ &= B_{kji} \widehat{M}^{ks} \widehat{M}^{j\ell} p_s p_\ell \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(B_{kji} + B_{jki}) \widehat{M}^{ks} \widehat{M}^{j\ell} p_s p_\ell, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the symmetrization in (19) with respect to indices k and j is valid since F_i^J is a quadratic function of $\widehat{M}^{-1}p$. Observe in (19) that it is the symmetric part $\frac{1}{2}(B_{kji} + B_{jki})$ of B_{kji} with respect to the first two indices that essentially contributes to the dynamics (16), but the skew-symmetric part $\frac{1}{2}(B_{kji} - B_{jki})$ of B_{kji} with respect to the first two indices do not appear in the dynamics at all. Since (B_{ijk}) and (J_{ij}^k) are isomorphically related by (18), it follows that only part of (J_{ij}^k) contributes to the dynamics (16).

The natural question that now arises is how to express the essential part of (J_{ij}^k) that appears in the dynamics (16), removing all the unnecessary components. Define $C = C_{ijk}e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$C(u,v,w) = \frac{1}{2}(B(u,v,w) + B(v,u,w)) \quad \forall u,v,w \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

or in coordinates

$$C_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(B_{ijk} + B_{jik}), \tag{20}$$

where $B = B_{ijk}e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the (0, 3)-tensor field defined in (18). By Lemma 2, the tensor field C defined above indeed belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and such a C expresses exactly the symmetric part $\frac{1}{2}(B_{kji} + B_{jki})$ that contributes to the dynamics (16). Moreover, from Lemma 2, we can see that the use of the gyroscopic force $\widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C$ with $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

in (13) contains a smaller number of components than (J_{ij}^k) but still makes the same contribution to the dynamics as the term $J(q,p)\widehat{M}^{-1}p$ does. Concretely speaking, (J_{ij}^k) or equivalently (B_{ijk}) contains $\frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6}$ unnecessary components[1] that contribute no terms to the dynamics (16). Hence, we shall exclusively use the new form (13) in the rest of the paper.

2.4 Matching Conditions

We study the synthesis problem: what are the matching conditions for $\widehat{H}$ and C to satisfy in order to transform (12) to (13)?

Let $G^\perp(q)$ denote an $(n-m)\times n$ matrix whose rows span the left annihilator[2] of the column space of $G(q)$ such that $\operatorname{rank} G^\perp = n-m$ and $G^\perp G = 0$. For the sake of simplicity, we also denote by $G^\perp(q)$ the left annihilator of $G(q)$. Then, by comparing equations (12) and (13) and collecting terms of equal degrees in p, we obtain the matching conditions:

$$0 = G^\perp(\partial_q V - \widehat{M}M^{-1}\partial_q \widehat{V}) \tag{21}$$

$$0 = G^\perp(\partial_q(p^T M^{-1}p) - \widehat{M}M^{-1}\partial_q(p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p) + 2\widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C), \tag{22}$$

where the first set is called the potential matching conditions and the second the kinetic matching conditions. The difference between the two dynamics (12) and (13) is taken care of by the feedback law:

$$u = (G^TG)^{-1}G^T(\partial_q H - \widehat{M}M^{-1}\partial_q\widehat{H} - GK_vG^T\partial_p\widehat{H} + \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner \widehat{M}^{-1}p \lrcorner C). \tag{23}$$

The number of PDEs in the kinetic matching conditions is $\frac{n(n+1)(n-m)}{2}$ if we simply set the coefficients of p_ip_j's to zero in (22). However, we can reduce the number of PDEs in the kinetic matching conditions by decomposing them into two groups: one without any entries of C_{ijk} and the other with some entries of C_{ijk}. For this purpose, let us introduce a $(2,1)$-tensor field $A = A_k^{ij}(q)e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e^k$ and a $(0,3)$-tensor field $S = S_{ijk}(q)e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ that are defined as follows:

$$A_k^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\widehat{M}_{k\ell}M^{\ell r}\frac{\partial \widehat{M}^{ij}}{\partial q^r} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial M^{ij}}{\partial q^k} \tag{24}$$

and

$$S(u,v,w) = A(\widehat{M}u, \widehat{M}v, w) \quad \forall u,v,w \in \mathbb{R}^n \tag{25}$$

---

[1] Notice that $\frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6} > 0$ if and only if the number of degrees of freedom n is greater than 2.

[2] A left annihilator of a subspace U of a vector space V is a space defined by $\{\alpha \in V^* \mid \langle \alpha, u\rangle = 0 \forall u \in U\}$.

or in coordinates

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{ijk} &= A_k^{rs}\widehat{M}_{ri}\widehat{M}_{sj} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\widehat{M}_{k\ell}M^{\ell t}\frac{\partial \widehat{M}^{rs}}{\partial q^t}\widehat{M}_{ri}\widehat{M}_{sj} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^k}\widehat{M}_{ri}\widehat{M}_{sj} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\widehat{M}_{k\ell}M^{\ell t}\frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{ij}}{\partial q^t} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^k}\widehat{M}_{ri}\widehat{M}_{sj}. \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that

$$A_k^{ij} = A_k^{ji} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{ijk} = S_{jik}.$$

Then, the kinetic matching conditions in (22) can be written in the following compact form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C(\widehat{M}^{-1}p, \widehat{M}^{-1}p, w) = A(p,p,w) \;\; \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^n, w \in G^\perp \\
\Leftrightarrow\, &C(u,u,w) = A(\widehat{M}u, \widehat{M}u, w) \;\; \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n, w \in G^\perp \\
\Leftrightarrow\, &C(u,u,w) = S(u,u,w) \;\; \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n, w \in G^\perp \qquad (27) \\
\Leftrightarrow\, &C(u,v,w) = S(u,v,w) \;\; \forall u,v \in \mathbb{R}^n, w \in G^\perp \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the equivalence in (27) comes from (25), and the equivalence in (28) is due to the symmetry in their first two indices of both C and S and the polarization technique, i.e, $2C(u,v,w) = C(u+v,u+v,w) - C(u-v,u-v,w)$. The kinetic matching conditions (28) can be regarded as equations defining the tensor field C on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times G^\perp$ in terms of $\widehat{M}$ and M. By Lemma 4, there exists a $(0,3)$-tensor field $C = C_{ijk}(q)e^i \otimes e^j \otimes e^k$ satisfying (1), (2) and (28) if and only if S satisfies

$$S(u,v,w) + S(v,w,u) + S(w,u,v) = 0 \quad \forall u,v,w \in G^\perp, \qquad (29)$$

which is a set of PDEs for $\widehat{M}$, not containing any components of C. The number of PDEs in (29) is

$$\frac{(n-m+2)(n-m+1)(n-m)}{6} \qquad (30)$$

which is smaller than $\frac{n(n+1)(n-m)}{2}$, the number of PDEs in (22) before their re-grouping. Once the PDEs (29) are solved for $\widehat{M}$, then the tensor field C can be determined purely algebraically, following the procedure in the proof of Lemma 4.

This approach is an improvement of the conventional IDA-PBC method in [1, 18]. In the earlier works, the decomposition of the kinetic energy into the two groups was never done, so they often worked with the $\frac{n(n+1)(n-m)}{2}$ PDEs in (22) regarding $J(q,p)$ in (16) (or equivalently C in the new form (13)) as free parameter. For the purpose of comparison, let us consider the case of one degree of underactuation, i.e., $n-m=1$. In the conventional IDA-PBC procedure there are normally more than one PDEs for $\widehat{M}$ coming from the kinetic matching conditions (22); see [1] for example. In our method, however, the number of PDEs for $\widehat{M}$ is always one by (30). For example, if $G(q)$ is spanned by $\{e^2, \dots, e^n\}$, then our kinetic matching condition in (29) becomes

$$\widehat{M}_{1\ell} M^{\ell r} \frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{11}}{\partial q^r} + \frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^1} \widehat{M}_{r1} \widehat{M}_{s1} = 0. \tag{31}$$

This is only one quasi-linear PDE for only $\widehat{M}_{11}$. Compare this with the result in [1], where the number of kinetic matching PDEs increases as the number of underactuation degree increases. This shows the superiority of the new reduced kinetic matching conditions (29) that comes from the decomposition of the kinetic matching condition.

From the discussions in §2.3, it follows that (29) could be also obtained with the conventional form of IDA-PBC (16), but it has never been done anyway. Even with this conventional approach, one would have to go through the quadratic gyroscopic force via equations (18) – (20) and Lemmas 2 and 4, directly or indirectly. By introducing the quadratic gyroscopic force from the outset, we avoid this unnecessary detour.

2.5 Matching Conditions for Integrable $G(q)$

In §2.4 we studied how to reduce the number of PDEs in the kinetic matching condition, by eliminating the gyroscopic term C. We now show that the number of partial derivatives of $\widehat{M}_{ij}$ that appear in the kinetic matching PDEs, can be reduced when the co-distribution generated by the column vectors of $G(q)$ in the dynamics (12) is integrable, by which we mean the integrability of $G(q)$.

Suppose that $G(q) = \operatorname{span}\{e^{n-m+1}, \dots, e^n\}$ for each q such that $G^\perp(q) = \operatorname{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-m}\}$. Let us use the following three groups of indices: $i, j, k, \dots = 1, \dots, n$; $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots = 1, \dots, n-m$; and $a, b, c, \dots = n-m+1, \dots, n$. Then, the potential matching PDEs (21) are written as

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial q^\alpha} - \widehat{M}_{\alpha i} M^{ij} \frac{\partial \widehat{V}}{\partial q^j} = 0. \tag{32}$$

The new kinetic matching PDEs (29) are written as

$$S_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + S_{\beta\gamma\alpha} + S_{\gamma\alpha\beta} = 0 \tag{33}$$

where

$$S_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{M}_{\gamma\ell} M^{\ell t} \frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial q^t} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^\gamma} \widehat{M}_{r\alpha} \widehat{M}_{s\beta}.$$

Notice that the partial derivatives of only $\widehat{M}_{\alpha\beta}$ appear in this set of kinetic matching PDEs (33) whereas the partial derivatives of $\widehat{M}_{\alpha a}$ or $\widehat{M}_{ab}$ do not appear. It is also remarkable that $\widehat{M}_{ab}$'s do not appear at all in the matching PDEs in (32) or (33).

We now summarize the design procedure for IDA-PBC in the case when $G(q) = \operatorname{span}\{e^{n-m+1}, \dots, e^n\}$.

P1. Solve the matching PDEs in (32) and (33) for $\widehat{M}(q)$ and $\widehat{V}(q)$ such that $\widehat{M}(q)$ is positive definite and $\widehat{V}(q)$ obtains a non-degenerate minimum at $q = 0$. (For local positive definiteness of $\widehat{M}(q)$, it suffices to have positive definiteness of $\widehat{M}(0)$)

P2. Compute C following (8) – (11), using S_{ijk} in (26).

P3. Choose an arbitrary $m \times m$ positive definite symmetric matrix K_v.

P4. Compute the feedback law (23).

This procedure can be easily adapted to the case of non-integrable $G(q)$.

2.6 Case of Underactuation Degree One

We consider the following problem: when does the design procedure in §2.5 produce a (locally) positive definite symmetric matrix $\widehat{M}$ and a potential function $\widehat{V}$ having a non-degenerate minimum at $q = 0$? In general this is a difficult problem. However, complete answers are available for two cases: 1. when the controlled Hamiltonian is linear and 2. when the degree of underactuation is one, i.e, $n - m = 1$. The linear case is important not only by itself but also for the nonlinear case because the linear result is used in choosing an initial condition for the matching PDEs for the nonlinear case so that $\widehat{H}$ obtains a non-degenerate minimum at the equilibrium point. If the degree of underactuation is more than one, then solving the matching PDEs becomes a challenging job, which would normally involve the operations of prolongation and projection on the system of matching PDEs; refer to [19] for definition of prolongation and projection. Luckily, when the degree of underactuation is one, no knowledge of formal theory of systems of PDEs such as that in [19] is necessary, but a simple application of Frobenius' integrability theorem suffices.

Let us first take the linear case. Recall that the controlled Hamiltonian system (12) is called linear if M is a constant matrix, V is a quadratic function of q, and G is a constant matrix. For IDA-PBC of linear controlled Hamiltonian systems, the gyroscopic term C in (13) is not necessary since it would produce nonlinear terms in the dynamics.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that the controlled Hamiltonian system (12) is linear and has arbitrary degrees of underactuation. Then, it can be transformed to the desired form (13) with a constant positive definite symmetric matrix $\widehat{M}$, a positive definite quadratic function $\widehat{V}$, and $C = 0$ if and only if the system (12) is controllable or its uncontrollable dynamics are oscillatory[3]. Moreover, the closed-loop system (13) is exponentially stable if and only if the original system (12) is controllable.*

Proof. The Lagrangian equivalent of this theorem is proved in [9], and it can be easily adapted to the Hamiltonian case. See also [12] for a brief proof. □

---

[3] A linear dynamics $\dot{x} = Ax$ is called oscillatory if A is diagonalizable and each eigenvalue of A is a non-zero purely imaginary number.

We now consider the case of nonlinear controlled Hamiltonian systems with underactuation degree one.

Theorem 1. *Consider the controlled Hamiltonian system (12) with one degree of underactuation. Let* Σ^ℓ *be its linearization at the equilibrium* $(q,p) = (0,0)$*. The system (12) can be transformed to the desired form (13) with* $\widehat{H}$ *having a non-degenerate local minimum at* $(q,p) = (0,0)$*,* $K_v = K_v^T$ *being positive definite, and* $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, if and only if* Σ^ℓ *is controllable or the uncontrollable dynamics of* Σ^ℓ *are oscillatory. Moreover, the closed-loop system (13) is (locally) exponentially stable if and only if* Σ^ℓ *is controllable.*

Proof. For the sake of simplicity of presentation, we assume that $G(q)$ is integrable such that $G(q) = \{e^2, \dots, e^n\}$. Then, the potential and kinetic matching conditions in (32) and (33) can be written as

$$\widehat{M}_{1i} M^{ij} \frac{\partial \widehat{V}}{\partial q^j} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial q^1} = 0 \tag{34}$$

$$\widehat{M}_{1i} M^{ij} \frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{11}}{\partial q^j} + \frac{\partial M^{ij}}{\partial q^1} \widehat{M}_{i1} \widehat{M}_{j1} = 0. \tag{35}$$

Write the Hamiltonian H^ℓ of the linearization Σ^ℓ of (12) at the origin as

$$H^\ell = \frac{1}{2} p^T M^{-1}(0) p + \frac{1}{2} q^T D^2 V(0) q$$

where $M^{-1}(0)$ is the evaluation of $M^{-1}(q)$ at $q = 0$, and $D^2 V$ is the second-derivative matrix of V. Suppose that Σ^ℓ is controllable or its uncontrollable dynamics are oscillatory. Then, by Lemma 5 there are two constant positive definite symmetric matrices $\overline{M}$ and $\overline{S}$ such that

$$\overline{M}_{1i} M^{ij}(0) \overline{S}_{jk} - \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial q^1 \partial q^k}(0) = 0 \tag{36}$$

which is the potential matching condition for Σ^ℓ. The kinetic matching condition trivially holds for Σ^ℓ since M and $\overline{M}$ are constant matrices. Notice that the set of PDEs in (34) and (35) for $\widehat{V}$ and $\widehat{M}_{11}$ is integrable, which can be easily checked by applying Frobenius' theorem; refer to [17] for Frobenius' theorem. We now impose the following initial conditions on $\widehat{M}$ and $\widehat{V}$ at $q = 0$:

$$\widehat{M}(0) = \overline{M}, \quad d\widehat{V}(0) = 0, \quad D^2 \widehat{V}(0) = \overline{S}. \tag{37}$$

The initial conditions at $q = 0$ are compatible with the PDE (34) since the differentiation of (34) and its evaluation at $q = 0$ yields

$$\widehat{M}_{1i}(0) M^{ij}(0) \frac{\partial^2 \widehat{V}}{\partial q^j \partial q^k}(0) - \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial q^1 \partial q^k}(0) = 0 \tag{38}$$

where $d\widehat{V}(0) = 0$ is used. Equation (38) has the same structure as (36). Hence, by Frobenius' theorem there exist $\widehat{M}$ and $\widehat{V}$ that satisfy (34), (35) and (37). Due to the initial conditions (37), the desired Hamiltonian $\widehat{H} = \frac{1}{2}p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p + \widehat{V}(q)$ obtains a non-degenerate local minimum value at $(q,p) = (0,0)$. Choose C, K_v and u following the procedure in §2.5. We have successfully transformed the given system (12) to the desired form (13).

Suppose now that the given nonlinear controlled Hamiltonian system (12) can be transformed to the desired form (13) with $\widehat{H} = \frac{1}{2}p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p + \widehat{V}(q)$. Through linearization, we can see that the linearization Σ^ℓ of (12) gets transformed to the following linear dynamics:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \dot{p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M^{-1}(0)\widehat{M}(0) \\ -\widehat{M}(0)M^{-1}(0) & -G(0)K_v(0)G^T(0) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_q \widehat{H}^\ell \\ \partial_p \widehat{H}^\ell \end{bmatrix}, \tag{39}$$

where $\widehat{H}^\ell = \frac{1}{2}p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}(0)p + \frac{1}{2}q^T D^2\widehat{V}(0)q$ with both $\widehat{M}(0)$ and $D^2\widehat{V}(0)$ positive definite and symmetric. Hence, the linear controlled Hamiltonian system Σ^ℓ is controllable or its uncontrollable dynamics are oscillatory by Lemma 5. This completes the proof of the first statement that the system (12) can be transformed to the desired form (13) if and only if Σ^ℓ is controllable or the uncontrollable dynamics of Σ^ℓ are oscillatory.

We now prove the statement on exponential stability. By the Lyapunov linearization theorem, the closed-loop system (13) is exponentially stable if and only if its linearized dynamics, say the one in (39), is exponentially stable. From Lemma 5, we know that (39) is exponentially stable if and only if the linearization Σ^ℓ of the original nonlinear controlled Hamiltonian system (12) is controllable. This completes the proof.

□

Theorem 1 is important because it gives necessary and sufficient conditions for Lyapunov/exponential stabilizability by IDA-PBC for the case of underactuation degree one. Moreover, the conditions therein are on the given system (12) that can be easily verified in advance before any attempt to find a desired system (13). In the past, they had only sufficient conditions for stabilizability by IDA-PBC, so they were inconclusive on stabilizability by IDA-PBC when the sufficient conditions did not hold.

Theorem 1 applies to a wide range of systems including the inverted pendulum on a car, the Pendubot, the Furuta pendulum, the ball and beam system, and the planar vertical take off and landing aircraft, the linearization of each of which is controllable. We remark that the resultant feedback controller (23) is nonlinear.

2.7 Examples

We consider the inverted pendulum on a cart. The mass matrix M and the potential function V are given by

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_1\ell^2 & M_1\ell\cos q^1 \\ M_1\ell\cos q^1 & M_1 + M_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$V(q) = M_1 g\ell(1 - \cos q^1).$$

Since control is given in the q^2 direction, we have

$$G(q) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Our main purpose is to illustrate the design procedure in §2.5, so we choose the following values of parameters:

$$M_1 = M_2 = \ell = 1, \quad g = 10.$$

One can easily check that the linearization of this system at the origin is controllable. Hence, by Theorem 1 we can exponentially stabilize this system with the method of IDA-PBC.

Let us now construct a control law following the procedure in §2.5. The potential and kinetic matching conditions in (32) and (33) are given, after simplification, as

$$(2\widehat{M}_{11} - \widehat{M}_{12}\cos q^1)\frac{\partial \widehat{V}}{\partial q^1} + (-\widehat{M}_{11}\cos q^1 + \widehat{M}_{12})\frac{\partial \widehat{V}}{\partial q^1} = 10\sin q^1(2 - \cos^2 q^1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(2\widehat{M}_{11} - \widehat{M}_{12}\cos q^1)&\frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{11}}{\partial q^1} + (-\widehat{M}_{11}\cos q^1 + \widehat{M}_{12})\frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{11}}{\partial q^1} \\ &= \frac{2\sin q^1(2\widehat{M}_{11} - \widehat{M}_{12}\cos q^1)(\widehat{M}_{12} - \widehat{M}_{11}\cos q^1)}{2 - \cos^2 q^1}.\end{aligned}$$

A solution is found to be

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{M}_{11} &= 2\cos^2 q^1 - \epsilon, \qquad \widehat{M}_{12} = (4 - \epsilon)\cos q^1, \\ \widehat{V} &= -\frac{10}{\epsilon}\cos q^1 + \left(q^2 + \frac{2\sin q^1}{\epsilon}\right)^2\end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \epsilon < 2$ is a constant. To make $\widehat{M}$ positive definite at least locally around $q = 0$, we choose an $\widehat{M}_{22}$ such that $\widehat{M}_{22} > (\widehat{M}_{12})^2/\widehat{M}_{11}$ at $q = 0$. For example,

$$\widehat{M}_{22} = K + \frac{(4 - \epsilon)^2\cos^2 q^1}{2\cos^2 q^1 - \epsilon}$$

where $K > 0$ is a constant parameter. It is easy to see that $(q, p) = (0, 0)$ is the minimum point of the Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}p^T\widehat{M}^{-1}p + \widehat{V}(q)$ over the set $I_\epsilon \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2$, where

$$I_\epsilon := \cos^{-1}\left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}, 1\right]\right) \subset \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

Notice that $I_\epsilon \to (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Compute the gyroscopic tensor C using (8) – (11) and (26) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{111} &= C_{222} = 0,\\
C_{121} &= C_{211} = S_{121}\\
C_{221} &= S_{221}\\
C_{112} &= -2S_{121}\\
C_{122} &= C_{212} = -\frac{1}{2}S_{221},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{121} &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\widehat{M}_{1r}M^{rs}\frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{12}}{\partial q^s} + \frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^1}\widehat{M}_{r1}\widehat{M}_{s2}\right),\\
S_{221} &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\widehat{M}_{1r}M^{rs}\frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{22}}{\partial q^s} + \frac{\partial M^{rs}}{\partial q^1}\widehat{M}_{r2}\widehat{M}_{s2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Choose a $K_v = K_v^T > 0$ and compute the feedback control law (23). The closed-loop system is exponentially stable by Theorem 1.

Let us consider another example. Suppose that we are given a controlled Hamiltonian system of the form (12) with

$$\begin{aligned}
M(q) &= \begin{bmatrix} 5+\cos q^3 & \sin(q^1-q^2) & \sin(q^3-q^1)\\ \sin(q^1-q^2) & 5+\cos(q^1-q^3) & \sin q^2\\ \sin(q^3-q^1) & \sin q^2 & 5+\cos(q^2) \end{bmatrix},\\
V(q) &= \cos(q^1+q^2) + \cos(q^2+q^3) + \cos q^3,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$G(q) = \begin{bmatrix} \sin q^2 & 1\\ 1 & \sin q^3\\ \sin q^1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $q = (q^1, q^2, q^3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We want to stabilize the equilibrium at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$. This system has one degree of underactuation, and its linearized system at the origin is controllable, which is easy to verify. Hence, by Theorem 1 the origin can be exponentially stabilized with the IDA-PBC method.

3 Conclusions

We have improved the method of IDA-PBC in several ways. First, we have showed that there is redundancy in the skew-symmetric interconnection matrix in the conventional form of IDA-PBC, and then have replaced the skew-symmetric interconnection matrix term with a gyroscopic force to remove the redundancy. We have derived the matching conditions and decomposed them into two parts. As a result of the decomposition, we have come up with a smaller number of kinetic matching PDEs than those in the literature. Moreover, a smaller number of entries of the desired mass matrix appear in the kinetic matching PDEs when controls are given in coordinate directions. Easily verifiable necessary and sufficient conditions are given for Lyapunov/exponential stabilizability by IDA-PBC for all linear controlled Hamiltonian (or simple mechanical) systems with arbitrary degree of underactuation and for all nonlinear controlled Hamiltonian (or simple mechanical) systems with one degree of underactuation. A synthesis procedure with IDA-PBC was provided and illustrated on the system of an inverted pendulum on a cart. We plan to study the case of higher degree of underactuation and force shaping for IDA-PBC in the future.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the late professor Jerrold E. Marsden for his ever-lasting advice, Zhao Jin and Waiman Ng for their constructive comments, and professor Hyung-Bo Shim for his invitation to Seoul National University in August 2011, where the author wrote substantial part of the paper.

References

[1] J.A. Acosta, R. Ortega, A. Astolfi, and A. Mahindrakar, “Interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control of mechanical systems with underactuation degree one,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 50, 1936 – 1955, 2005.

[2] S. Arimoto and F. Miyazaki, “Stability and robustness of PID feedback control for robot manipulators of sensory capability,” in *Robotics Research, First International Symposium*, M. Brady and R. P. Paul, eds., MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 783 – 799, 1983.

[3] A.M. Bloch, P.S. Krishnaprasad, J.E. Marsden, and G. Sanchez de Alvarez, “Stabilization of rigid body dynamics by internal and external torques,” *Automatica*, 28, 745 – 756, 1992.

[4] A.M. Bloch, N.E. Leonard and J.E. Marsden, “Stabilization of mechanical systems using controlled Lagrangians,” in *Proc. 36th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 1997.

[5] A.M. Bloch, D.E. Chang, N.E. Leonard and J.E. Marsden, “Controlled Lagrangians and the stabilization of mechanical systems II: Potential shaping,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.,* 46, 1556 – 1571, 2001.

[6] A.M. Bloch, N.E. Leonard and J.E. Marsden, "Controlled Lagrangians and the stabilization of mechanical systems I: The first matching theorem," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.,* 45, 2253 – 2270, 2000.

[7] A.M. Bloch, N.E. Leonard, and J.E. Marsden, "Controlled Lagrangians and the stabilization of Euler-Poincaré mechanical systems," *Internat. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, 11, 191 – 214, 2001.

[8] D.E. Chang, "Some results on stabilizability of controlled Lagrangian systems by energy shaping," in *Proc. of the 17th IFAC World Congress*, Seoul, South Korea, 2008.

[9] D.E. Chang,"The method of controlled Lagrangians: Energy plus force shaping," *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, 48 (8), 4821 – 4845, 2010.

[10] D.E. Chang, "Stabilizability of controlled Lagrangian systems of two degrees of freedom and one degree of under-actuation," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 55 (8), 1888 – 1893, 2010.

[11] D.E. Chang, "Generalization of the IDA-PBC method for stabilization of mechanical systems," in *Proc. 18th Mediterranean Conference on Control & Automation*, 226 – 230, Marrakech, Morocco, June 2010.

[12] D.E. Chang, "Pseudo-energy shaping for the stabilization of a class of second-order systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control,* 22 (18), 1999 – 2013, 2012.

[13] D.E. Chang, A.M. Bloch, N.E. Leonard, J.E. Marsden, and C. Woolsey, "The equivalence of controlled Lagrangian and controlled Hamiltonian systems," *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 8, 393 – 422, 2002.

[14] B. Gharesifard, A.D. Lewis, and A.-R. Mansouri, "A geometric framework for stabilization by energy shaping: sufficient conditions for existence of solutions," *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, **8** (4), 353 – 398, 2008.

[15] R.D. Gregg, T. Bretl, and M.W. Spong, "A control theoretic approach to robot-assisted locomotor therapy", in *Proc. Conference on Decision and Control*, 1679 – 1686, 2010.

[16] J.K. Holm, D. Lee and M.W. Spong, "Time-scaling trajectories of passive-dynamic Bipedal robots," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation,* 3603 – 3608, 2007.

[17] J.M. Lee, *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, Springer, 2002.

[18] R. Ortega and E. Garcia-Canseco, "Interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control: A survey," *Eur. J. Control*, **10**, 432 – 450, 2004.

[19] J.F. Pommaret, *Partial Differential Equations and Group Theory: New Perspectives for Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.

[20] J. Seipel and P. Holmes, "A simple model for clock-actuated legged locomotion," *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics,* 12 (5), 502 – 520, 2007.

[21] D.V. Zenkov, "Matching and stabilization of linear mechanical systems," in *Proc. the 15th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and System*, South Bend, IN, 2002.